

Release
Date: March 23, 1999
Release #: S.C. 12/99

SUMMARY OF CASES ACCEPTED DURING THE WEEK OF MARCH 15, 1999

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The description or descriptions set out below do not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#99-40 People v. Camacho, S075720. (B118008; 68 Cal.App.4th 37.)
Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case concerns whether police officers violated defendant's reasonable expectation of privacy when they traversed an open, grassy, side yard while investigating a complaint of excessive noise and, through an uncovered window, observed defendant packaging drugs inside a house.

#99-41 Comedy III Productions, Inc. v. Gary Saderup, Inc., S076061. (B120382; 68 Cal.App.4th 744.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part the judgment in a civil action. This case concerns whether the imposition of liability for unauthorized use of the likeness of a deceased person (Civ. Code, §990) applies only to the use of such likeness in advertising and whether defendant's use of drawings of the Three Stooges on tee shirts and posters was properly found to lack expressive value and not to be constitutionally protected.

(over)

STATUS

#99-31 Syntex Corp. v. Lowsly-Williams & Companies S075573. The court limited review to issues concerning 1) whether an employee's knowledge may be imputed to his or her corporate employer to determine whether property damage was expected or intended by the corporation, 2) whether the collective knowledge of a corporation's employees should be considered in determining whether property damage was expected or intended, 3) whether property damage is expected for purposes of insurance coverage if the insured expects any degree or kind of property damage, and 4) whether the absence of a special verdict or finding by the jury as to the timing of property damage was prejudicial error.

#